



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers in the Editio Minor of Gebhardt-Harnack-Zahn. By HENRY B. ROBISON, PH.D. Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament, Second Series, Vol. II, Part 5. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1913. Royal 8vo, pp. 45.

The author of this study has executed his work—to judge from the portion I have checked—with great care and diligence. His purpose was to classify the uses of the participle found in the texts indicated according to the scheme provided by Burton's *New Testament Moods and Tenses*; and what he wished to accomplish he has accomplished very successfully. Equal praise, however, cannot be given to the planning of the work. The choice of this system of classification must, of course, appear unfortunate to a student of historical grammar. For the *New Testament Moods and Tenses* was avowedly non-historical; and in particular its treatment of the participle, which deviated from the usual scheme, was no improvement. In the traditional treatment of the participle the defect had been the tendency to set up a number of categories based upon distinctions which were entirely extra-linguistic, the results of purely logical operations. In Professor Burton's system this defect was exaggerated and it has passed on into Dr. Robison's work—in spite of the protests made in some of the works cited in his bibliography.

Especial attention may be called to the treatment of the negatives with the participle. The distinction is made on p. 39 as follows: “*Μή* . . . expresses the condition, reason, etc., of the action of the participle; it is subjective, expressing some mental attitude of the subject of the principal verb toward the action denoted by the participle. When used of external fact, it leaves the fact of the action in the background and brings the condition, cause, etc., of the action into prominence.” “The presence of *οὐ* can, in general, be explained by noting that the action to which it is applied is conceived to be simply a matter of fact. It leaves the condition, cause, etc., of the action out of view and asserts the fact simply as such. Both *μή* and *οὐ* are used of external fact, but with the above difference apparently well marked.” The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* here is the belief that a shift of form must reflect some shift of meaning. That belief is a heritage from the non-historical, philosophical period of the study of language, and the best corrective for it is to be found in Bloomfield's article “On Instability in the Use of Moods in Earliest Sanskrit,” *AJP*, XXXIII (1912), 1-29, an article that is to be warmly commended to all syntacticians. The history of the negative with the participle is the encroachment of *μή* upon *οὐ*. For the classic period it is traced in detail in an excellent Hopkins dissertation by William F. Gallaway, *On the Use of Μή with the Participle in Classical Greek*, Baltimore, 1897, which is the most serious omission in Dr. Robison's bibliography. The end is the triumph of *μή*, and Dr. Robison's work shows how nearly that is at hand in

the Apostolic Fathers. Of *μή* and its compounds there are 139 examples, while *οὐ* is used 29 times, and its compounds not at all. *Οὐ* has persisted only when it is adherescent, *οὐ γινώσκοντες*, *οὐ δυνηθέντες*, *οὐ δεόντων*, *οὐκ ὄντας*, *οὐκ εἰδότες*, or where there is a strong rhetorical antithesis: *ὡς σώζων ἔπεμψεν*, *ὡς πείθων*, *οὐ βιαζόμενος*; *ἔπεμψεν ὡς καλῶν*, *οὐ διώκων*; *ἔπεμψεν ὡς ἀγαπῶν*, *οὐ κρίνων*.—*βλάβην γὰρ οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν μᾶλλον δὲ κίνδυνον ὑποίσομεν μέγαν* (hardly to be counted)—*εἶδον . . . οὐ μέντοι σκιρτῶντα—ταῦτα, ἀδελφοί, οὐκ ἔμαντῷ ἐπιτρέψας γράφω . . . ἄλλ' ἐπεὶ . . . ἔγνω . . . οὐ προσεληφότας . . . ἄλλ' . . . συγχωροῦντας*. The interesting thing would be to know whether *μή* is already intruding in this type of sentence also; but that cannot be ascertained readily from Dr. Robison's work.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike. Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte. By BERNHARD LAUM. Erster Band: *Darstellung*; zweiter Band: *Urkunden*. Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner, 1914. M. 18.

The collecting of the materials and the analyzing of them in detail are obvious necessities in the scientific investigation of any subject. This part of his work Dr. Laum did with meticulous care; and had he turned his notes over to the professors by whom the task was assigned they would have had some reason to be grateful to him. Instead, he has published them. For that scholars ought to be thankful, if they are interested in his subject; and, if the publisher does not lose too much money, and too many librarians and other purchasers are not victimized, everybody ought to be content. The reviewer, however, is not content. The second volume he is willing to commend: it presents the documents, literary and epigraphical, relating to foundations in antiquity, arranged rather mechanically according to the districts from which they come and according to the languages—Greek, Latin, Egyptian, Babylonian—in which they are written. The Egyptian and Babylonian sources are presented in German translations only; the others are accompanied by translations into German. For the collection completeness is claimed, and the claim is attested by the authority of one of the professors. It is not easy for a reviewer to dispute such a contention. Nevertheless, he wonders why no text is included alluding to the many Ptolemaic, Seleucid, Antigonid, and other *Stiftungen* in accordance with which *φιάλαι* were dedicated annually at Delos. But he does not quarrel on that account with the collection as a whole, which may prove quite useful. It is with the first volume that he is dissatisfied. It is entitled *Darstellung* and is described as a *Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*; but it is in reality an expanded table of contents, contaminated with an index to the materials contained in volume two. Anything less interesting and